App. F. IX-4

Previous References

1930.
(Mangalore)

File No. 48-30

Serial Nos. 1-5

Later References

Mis 43-31-2

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Serial Nos. 5

Part B for March 1931

SUBJECT.

Appeal against the order of the Asst. Comr. re the Archakship of Sri Venkataramanaswami and other temples at Hukkal, Tumkur Taluq.

No. 2120 dated 28. 3. 31

To the Asst. Comr

The order of the Asst. Comr is set aside and the appeal is allowed.

Sd.

General and Revenue Secretariat | Mug. File No. 48 of 1930-1

Serial No.

1

Petition dated 21st July 1930.
from Venkamma. wife of Archak Shamachar Hirkkal, Tumkur Taluk appealing against the order of the Mug. Commr directing that ~~the~~ the Archakship of the Sri Venkataramana Swamy temple and other temples at Hirkkal, ~~in the~~ be Continued to Devaraja Bhatta unless he is proved incompetent and praying that an order be issued staying the execution of the Mug. Commr's order. etc.

1) 1st Member's orders on the petition
" Mug. Records may be called for. No Stay order
Mnk
22/7/30.

2) Subd with a draft. letter to Mr and a draft. Endt: to the party.
GS MNK
23/7

3) Issue
24.7.30

Note—Contn. Sheet

WD 01684—GPB—30,000—20-4-29

Muz A 1930 (No 2 of 30-31
454

App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat

Muz File No. 48 of 1930

Serial No.	
2.	To. The Muz Comr No. 205 § 25-7-30. Forwards the petition and calls for a report with records.
3	To. Venkamma (no. 206 § 25-7-30. Informs her that a petition was called for from the Muz Comr and that no Muz order can be granted.
4	From the Muz. Comm'r. No: 172/30-31 dated 17.9.30. Forwards the vernacular records connected with the case

Secs.

AGENL & FEV S
26 JUL 1930
MUZRAI.

4 Subs for orders with all the records flagged in the records. The facts of the case are detailed in the Muz Comm's order. (Vide Flag: P2)

5 If approved, the case will be posted for hearing on a date to be fixed by the Hon'ble Member

by order
H. Secy)
7.10.30.

3831/8

OFFICE OF THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL
22 OCT. 1930
No. 4022

1st Member)
2/10

Member's orders
May be posted for hearing at 3 PM on 15/11/1930

WD 01684—GPL—30,000—29 1 29

Mrz Appl. 21 of 30

General and Revenue Secretariat

Mrz File No. 48 A of 1930.

Serial No.

OFFICE OF THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL
21 NOV. 1930
No. 5220

On the last date of hearing viz 15/11/30 Mr K. N. Srinivasan Advocate filed a Vakalat on behalf of the appellant. Vankatarama & Mr K. Krishnamachar on behalf of Devaraja Mudaliar, the respondent; an adjournment was prayed for.

10 Orders issued in person.
" Adjourn to another date".

11 Orders are solicited as to the date to which the case may be posted & notice issued to parties

20/11 (1st Member) 21.11.3

Member's orders.
12 May be posted for hearing at 2.30 pm on Saturday the 13th Dec 1930.
24/11/30

OFFICE OF THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL
10 DEC 1930
No. 5543

Part 2 as filed
&
9/1/31

OFFICE OF THE THIRD MEMBER OF COUNCIL
9 JAN. 1931
NOTE - Contn. Sheet
No. 336

How many cases are there to be heard?

WD 0255--50,000—GPB—5-7

Muz. File No. 48 of 1930. | General and Revenue Secretariat

This case was heard on 23rd March 1931.

The Appellant Venkamma was present and was represented by her Counsel Mr. Mallappa: the Respondent Devaraj Bhatta was also present and was represented by his Lawyer Mr.H.Krishnappa.

The Appellant is the Hukdar of the office of Archak of the temples and any one permitted to perform the duties of the office can only work as ~~a~~ her gumasta. The Appellant is not willing to continue the Respondent as her Gumasta. Her present nominee Kaidal Srinivasachar is stated to be residing in the Hikkal village in which the temples are situated unlike Devaraj Bhatta who is stated to be living elsewhere. There is no reason why Srinivasachar should not be allowed to work as the ~~Appellant's gumasta~~ Archak. In these circumstances, the order of the Muzrai Commissioner is set aside and the appeal allowed.

the Respondent

the Gumasta proposed by the Appellant

24.3.31

25.3.31

No 2120 of 28/3/31 to the Muzrai Commissioner forwarding Copy of the above decision

General and Revenue Secretariat | Mug File No. 48 of 1930.

Serial No.	
	No 2122 of 28/2/31 forwarding Copy of the decision to Messrs K. N. Srini Vasan, R. P. Vasudeva Etc No 2121 of 28/2/31 to their H. Krishnappa advocate for the Respondent.

28/2/31

File No. of 193 General and Revenue Secretariat





Muz 28-30-1

Records to be called for. No stay pending

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF H.H.THE MAHARAJA

OF M Y S O R E.

Muz Rev: Appeal /30-31.



PETITIONER.

Archak Venkamma, Wife of Archak Shamachar,
Age 65 years, Residing in Hikkal,
Tumkur Taluk.

COUNTER PETITIONER.

Devaraj Bhatta Son of Giriachar,
Residence as above.

Regarding Gumasta question:- of Archakship to Sri Venkataramana Swami and other temples at Hikkal.

Under Section 22 of the Mysore Muzrai Regulation against the order of Muzrai Commissioner in Muz:Appeal 42/28-29, Muz:Appeal 46 of 1929-30.

1. The petitioner is the recognised Registerdar Pujari or Archak of the afore-said Hikkal temples.

2. That as per decision of Government dated, 20-1-1912, rights of fomale heirs has been recognised to Pujari Office.

(3

3. That, for some time, the petitioner had nominated the Counter-petitioner as her Gumasta - Pujari to look after the duties.

4. As there were several complaints by the Devotees against the continuance of the Counter-petitioner as Pujari - Gumasta, both to the petitioner and to the Muzrai authorities the petitioner had to pursuade one Kaidal Srinivasachar, who is well-versed in Agama lore, to become Pujari Gumasta and thereupon the Muzrai authorities sanctioned the appointment.

5. That since then, the afore-said Srinivasa Char has been not only doing his duties to the -- complete satisfaction of the devotees, authorities, but also looking to the interests of the petitioner, who is a helpless aged widow and therefore it is inequitable to remove him now after years of satisfactory work.

6. That, owing to spite the counter-petitioner filed a petition to the Sub Division Officer who not only passed adverse order against the petitioner but ~~who~~ went to the length of denying the petitioner's huk itself to the office.

7. That upon appeal, the learned Deputy Commissioner set aside the order of the Sub Division Officer and passed orders to continue the services of Srinivasachar.

8. The Muzrai Commissioner in Muzrai appeal

appeal

appeal No.42/28-29 has passed order on 28-4-30 to the effect that Counter-petitioner to be re-instated till he is proved incompetent.

9. That the devotees of the Temple -- knowing of the passing of such order by the Muzrai Commissioner have filed petitions to the Amildar, Sub-Division-Officer, Deputy Commissioner and also to the Muzrai Commissioner, saying that the Counter-petitioner ought not to be allowed to perform Puja and that he is in-competent and that they would prove all the allegations and till then the old Pujari may continue.

10. That, in spite of this, the Shekdar .. pressed upon the petitioner to hand over charge of Pujari-ship to which she said that Puja vessals etc., are with Srinivasachar.

11. The learned Muzrai Commissioner has not considered the following primary points of complaint against the Counter-petitioner:-

(1) Non-residence in village,.

(2) Not even owning a house in Hikkal.

(3) Not stopping at the Temple at stated hours to perform Pujas.

(4) Teasing the devotees to give grain money etc.,

(5) Not well-versed in the Agama lore.

(6) Not courteous to devotees.

(7) Refusal to participate with the petitioner in the produce and income of the Pujari-ship and showing a defiant attitude to her.

(8) In Muzrai 12/26-27 Government have warned Devaraja Bhatta's father with dismissal.

12. That the order of the Muzrai Commissioner ~~passed an order~~ dated on 28-4-30 saying that petitioner used her discretion capriciously in -- appointing the Srinivasa char as Gumasta, is not correct, as could be seen with reference to previous Proceedings.

13. That thereafter the petitioner filed a Review petition to the Muzrai Commissioner in Muzrai Appeal No.46/29-30 on 26-6-30 praying to Review his order upon the grounds mentioned in para 11 Supra.

14. That generally the wishes of the Barawardar ~~is~~ are consulted in the appointment of gumasta (Vide Revenue Petition No.56/14-15).

15. That the Muzrai Commissioner has -- simply rejected her Petition on 4-7-1930 without even hearing her.

16. That the petitioner is prepared to let in evidence to show that the Counter-petitioner is in-competent to act as Gumasta -- Pujari.

17. That therefore the petitioner prays that this Honourable Court would revise the Order of the Muzrai Commissioner and remand the case for enquiry to the Sub Division Officer to take

take

take evidence on the question of competency and then dispose of the case on merits.

18. That till then, stay order may kindly be issued to keep the Muzrai Commissioner's Order allowing Devaraja Bhat to act as Pujari, Gumasta in abeyance.

19. That if no stay order is urgently issued, Devaraja Bhat will take possession of Pujari-ship much against the wishes of the devotees who would thereby refuse to go to the temple.

20. The petitioner prays that the order of the Muzrai Commissioner be set aside and the petitions of the devotees may be considered along with this petition.

B A N G A L O R E,
D/21st July 1930.

L. F Mark

PETITIONER.

I the petitioner above named do hereby solemnly affirm and declare that what is stated above is true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

L F Mark

PETITIONER.

B A N G A L O R E.
D/21st July 1930.

Enclosures.

Order of Mag. Cant. in Mag. Ap. 42/28.29

do in Mag. Ap. 46/29.30

Vakalat.







In the Court of the Muzrai Commissioner
in Mysore
Dated, Bangalore, 28th April 1930

Muzrai appeal no 42 of 1928-29

Appellant:-
Devaraja Bhatta son of Giriacha,
Hikkal, Tumkur Taluk.

OF THE MUZRAI

Respondent:-
Venkamma wife of Ramacha
Hikkal Tumkur Taluk.

Subject.

Appeals against the order of the Deputy
Commissioner, Tumkur District, directing
the registry of the Archakship of Sri
Venkataramanaswamy, and other
temples at Hikkal, Tumkur Taluk
in the name of the Respondent, the work
being attended to by a Gumasta
nominated by her.

M/s/o

Facts of the Case.

Lakshmipathiachar, Archak of the temples of Sri Venkataramana Swamy, Anjaneyaswami at Hikkal, Narasimhaswamy at Kurwek and Anjaneyaswamy at Rampanahalli, Tumkur Taluk, died of influenza on 4-11-1918 leaving no heirs except his mother Thimmamma and his brother's wife Venkamma. On 26th November 1918 these two survivors represented that they would have the weekly puja done by Rangachar of Kyatasandra the Archak of the Sri Lakshminarasimhaswami, temple at Devarayadurga One Srinivasachar of Kaidala put forth his claim to the office as being the brother of Thimmamma, i.e., uncle of the deceased and wanted the karaniam to be changed to his name and the produce of the inam lands given for the maintenance of the old woman

On ~~4-8-1923~~ 4-8-1919 Shambhog Venkatappa

Venkatappa represented that Puja in the Anjaneyaswami temple at Hikkal was being attended to by him, and that there was no puja in the other temple after the death of Lakshmipattiachar and prayed that the main lands of the Anjaneyaswami temple may be put in his possession and arrangements made for worship in other temples.

In the meanwhile orders were issued to the Sheikdar to distrain the produce of the main lands as it was noticed during jamabandi that puja was not being done in the temples. The Sheikdar submitted a report stating that since the death of Lakshmipattiacha, Venkamma had arranged for the performance of weekly puja by one of her grandsons, Kyatasandra Rungachar or Devaraja Bhatta on every Saturday; that the Kurnvelu and Hikkal temples had been repaired and that arrangements may be made to appoint an archak permanently among the claimants who could

M/516

live in the place and attend to puja regularly.

In her statements dated 31-12-1919 and 11-5-1920 Venkamma stated that Lakshmipathachar died issueless, that since then she has been getting the puja done by her grand children, Kyatasandra Rangachar or Devaraja Bhatta (sons of Girachar) and that she had no other relatives except the above and her son-in-law Archak Ramachandra Bhatta of Devarayadurga and prayed that the barawand may be made in his name and her grandson Devaraja Bhatta allowed to do puja.

Again in her statement dated 7-12-1921 Venkamma stated that Rangachar cannot come and permanently live at Hirkal, that his brother, Devaraja Bhatta, a boy of 16 years who was brought up by her as Sakumaga has been studying Yajur and cannot be disturbed immediately and that for the present Rangachar may be allowed to do the duties till Devaraja Bhatta

was able to take up office, as she had no other relatives except these two. In their Mahazar dated 16-2-1922 the villagers also stated that Rangacha was doing weekly puja regularly and may continue to do so till Devaraja Bhatta attained majority.

After recording the statement of Rangacha, the Amildar recommended that during the period Devaraja Bhatta was absent on study, his brother Rangacha might be permitted to attend to the duties of archakship and this was approved in his order of the Sub division Office dated 18-7-1923.

In the meantime, the Shanbhog and the Patel complained that as the archak had not yet come to live at the place but only came on Saturdays to do puja there was considerable inconvenience felt by the devotees that these persons

M/5/16

were not the Hakdas archaks and that Venkamma may be asked to arrange for an archak who would live in the place and do puja regularly. On 22-1-1926 on which date the order of the Subdivision Officer was communicated to Devaraja Bhatta his father Giriacha reported that he had handed over charge of the archakship to Devaraja Bhatta who had returned after completing his studies and that he would secure a house in the village and live there permanently. In her statement dated 20-2-1927 Venkamma also said that Devaraja Bhatta was not attending to the work but his father was doing it and that she would attend to the repairs and arrange for another archak also if Devaraja Bhatta did not come and live in the village permanently. Subsequently, however, the Amildar ordered that Venkamma should be

see.

be informed that since the archak had not come to live permanently at the place, another would be appointed In pursuance of this order Venkamma stated on 24-6-1927 that she would arrange to have her relative Kaidala Krishnamachar written a week for daily puja.

On 26-6-1927 Devaraja Bhatta stated that he ~~had~~ had come to live in the village from that date but the Shanbhog and Venkamma had arranged to get puja done by Srinivasachar of Kaidala and that the action of Venkamma was unauthorised. Thereupon the Sub division officer ordered that 3 to 6 months time might be given to the archak to live in the village permanently and that hereditary Hakdars should not be removed on the petition of villagers.

Venkamma petitioned the Sub Division officer on 22-12-1927 to the

effect that her nominee Krishnacha should be appointed as archak during her life-time. As in the meanwhile, Devaraja Bhatta had come and was living in the village and as the villagers had also given a mahazar to the same effect the Amildar's recommendation to take him on duty was approved by the sub division officer in his order of 18-7-1928 and an endorsement was issued to Venkamma accordingly.

Against this order Venkamma appealed to the Deputy Commissioner disclaiming her relationship to Devaraja Bhatta or his father and the appeal was allowed on the score that ~~the~~ she did not agree to the registry of the office in the name of Devaraja Bhatta but only stated that she was bringing up the appellant and some temporary arrangements had to be made for the conduct of worship.

The deputy commissioner cancelled the sub division officer's order and ordered the

the Change of registry in the name of Lakshamma the work being done by a Gumasta nominated by her.

It is against this order and the express statement of the respondent on more than one occasion, that Devaraja Bhatta has filed the present appeal.

Order No. R Dis No. 218 of 1929-30
Enclosures 3 28-4-30

The case was heard on 17th January 1930 when both the appellant and the respondent were present with their respective Counsels

The principle that the wishes of the Barawarda who is personally incompetent to discharge the duties should be consulted in appointing another person to officiate in her behalf does not mean that such discretion should be exercised Capriciously and an arrangement that has been in existence since 1923 terminated because she is now opposed to Devaraja Bhatta. As the Amildar and the Sub Division Officer

EDFT IN MYS

M/576

are satisfied that the duties can be performed satisfactorily by him there is no adequate reason to change him. Devaraja Bhatta will be continued as officiator unless he is proved to be incompetent.

/sd/ P. G. D'Souza,
Inamdar Commissioner in Mysore.

"Copy"



Majahar 5/6/30
Manager, Office of the
Inamdar Commissioner in
Mysore, Bangalore.

Copy applied for on 3-5-
Do ready on 8-5-30
Do delivered on 5-6-30
No: of words 1220
Copying fees 1—10—0
Comparing fees 0—4—4
Cost of additional papers 0—0—5
Copied by Gurudas
Compared by S Jayarama Das
8-5-30



Office of the Inamdar Commissioner
in Mysore.

Dated, Bangalore, 4th July 1930

No. Appeal 46 of 1929-30

Endorsement granted to Archak
Venkamma wife of Archak Shamacha,
residing at Hirkal, Inamdar
Taluk, in reply to the
petition received
No. 46/29-30 in
respect of the

Petition Register No. Inamdari 46/29-30
dated 19-6-1930
Subject:- Petition praying
for review of this Office order
in Appeal no. 42/28-29 (R. dis
218/29-30 dated 28-4-1930) re-
garding Inamdar Archakship
of Sri Venkatramanaswami
and other Inamdar Hirkal-
Inamdar Taluk.

the petition is informed that the
no review of the orders already passed. The said petition
is rejected.

Sd/ P. G. D'Souza
Inamdar Commissioner

Manager

Manager, Office of the Inamdar
Commissioner in Mysore, Bangalore.

OFFICE OF THE INAMDAR COMMR.
No. 56 of 29-30
JUL 1930

Copy applied for on 16-7-1930
do ready on 17-7-30
do delivered on
No: of words 116
Copying fee 0-4-0
Comparing fee 0-0-8
Cost of paper 0-0-1
Copied by Gurabacca
Compared by S. Jayaramaiah

In the Court of the Court of H. H. the Maharajah of Mysore

Muz. Rev

Muz Re Case No. : of 1920–1921.



Appellant, Plaintiff

Venkamma

Respondent, I Pet.

Devaraj Bhat

Vs.

1. I the appellant above named do by these presents retain Mr. S. Rajagopala Ayangar, Mr. K. Thamanna Advocates to appear in and conduct the above case on behalf to judgement.

2. I further empower him to execute any decree or order that may be passed in behalf and to receive from Court such sums of money as I may be entitled to get and to grant receipts therefor.

3. I also undertake to confirm and ratify all the legal acts done by the said Advocate in so doing.

L. T. Mark of Venkamma

Signed before me and personally known to me.

Accepted.

Advocate for

Advocate.

The S. G. N. Press, B—City

Bombay Bazaar Chickpet Bangalore City



ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ

Before the Government of H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore
Bangalore.

1930-31 ನೇ Revision Appeal ನಂಬರು. 2

ವಾದಿಯು ಯಾ ಅರ್ಜೀದಾರ್		ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ ಯಾ ಅಪ್ಪೋನೆಂಟ್
Appellant		Counter Petitioner
Archika Venkamma	Vs.	Devaraja Matha

ಮಾ|| ರಾ|| ಕೆ. ಯರ್. ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸರ್, ಎಂ. ಎ , ಎಲ್ಎಲ್. ಬಿ ,
ಮಾ|| ರಾ|| ಆರ್. ಶೇಷಾದ್ರಿ, ಬಿ. ಎ. ಎಲ್ಎಲ್. ಬಿ.
ಮಾ|| ರಾ|| ಎಂ. ವಿ. ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸರಾವ್, ಬಿ. ಎ. ಬಿ. ಎಲ್., ಅಡ್ವೋಕೇಟರನರಿಗೆ
Mr. R.P. Vasudeo B A B L Advocate
Mr. G. A. Subbaiah B A L L B Advocate

Appellant ಬರೆಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟು ಪಕಾಲತ್ ನಾಮಾ

ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ನನ್ನ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಅಪ್ಪೀಲುವಿನಿಗೂ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿವಾದ ಜರಿಗಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ನನ್ನ ಪರವಾಗುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾವಿಧವಾದ ಆರ್ಡರುಗಳನ್ನೂ ಡಿಕ್ರಿಯನ್ನೂ ಜಾರಿಗ್ಯಾನಜಿಸಿಜಣ ವಸೂಲುಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ರಾಜಿವಣ್ಣೆರೆಪ್ಪೆಸಲ್ಕುಡಿಸಕೆಕ್ಕ ಬಗ್ಯೂ,ನನಗೆಕೋರ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ಸಲ್ಲಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವ ಡಿಕ್ರಿರೆಬಲಗು, ಕಿಲ್ಲು ಮೊಬಲಗು ರೀಫೆಂಡು ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಂಪು ಮೊಬಲಗು ದಸ್ತೈವಜು ವಗ್ಗೆರೆಗಳನ್ನು ವಾಪರುಪಡಿಯುಲಿಕ್ಕೂ ಸಪತಮಗೆಈ ಮೂಲಕ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಪ್ಪೇನೆ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ತಾವಾಗಲಿ ಯಾ ತಮಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಮುಕ್ತ್ಯಾರ ಲಾಯರಾಗಿ ಡಿಟೋ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡಿಸುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನು ಬಾರ್ದ ಇಲ್ಲಾ ಸಹಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಬದ್ಧನಾಗಿ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ.

L-T. mark of Archika Venkamma.

ಈ ಮೊಕ್ತ್ಯಾರುನಾಮೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನನಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯವನ್ನು ಆಗಿ ನನ್ನ ಸಮಕ್ಷವು ರುಜು ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ JM

ಈ ಮೊಕ್ತ್ಯಾರುನಾಮೆ ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ

ತಾರೀಖು 15/11/30.

R. Vasudeo.
ಅಡ್ವೋಕೇಟರು

ಜೆಂಗಳೂರು

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಂದೀಕ ಭಾರತಿ ವಿಲಾಸ ಪ್ರೆಸ್ ಚಿಕ್ಕಬಳ್ಳಾಪುರ, ಕೆ. ಜಿ.



ಮೈಸೂರು ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ.

1930 ನೇ
~~1929—193~~ ನೇ ನವೆಂಬರ್ ನಂಬರು. 2

ನವೆಂಬರ್

ವಾದಿ ~~ಯಾ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರ್~~.

ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ ~~ಯಾ ಅಪ್ಪೋನೆಂಟ್~~,

ಮೈಂಪಕ್ಕ ... V. S. ... ಪಿಳ್ಳೆ ...

ಮಾನ್ಯರಾ ... ಗೆ.

ಬರಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟ ವಕಾಲತ್ನಾಮ.

ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ನನ್ನ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಆಪೈರುವರಿಗೂ ಕೋರ್ಟನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿವಾದ ಜರುಗಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೂ, ನನ್ನ ಪರ ಆಗುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಧವಾದ ಡಿಕ್ರಿಯನ್ನೂ, ಡಿಕ್ರಿಯನ್ನೂ, ಜಾರಿ ಕ್ರಮ ನಡಿಸಿ ಹಣ ವಸೂಲು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ, ನನಗೆ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ಸಲ್ಲಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವ ಡಿಕ್ರಿ ಮೊಬಲಗು, ಸಿಲ್ಕು ಮೊಬಲಗು ಸಹ ನಡಿಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ, ದಸ್ತೈವಜು ವಗೈರೆ ಗಳನ್ನು ವಾಪಸು ಪಡಿಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ ಸಹ ತಮಗೆ ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಧೇನೆ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ತಾವಾಗಲಿ ಯಾ ತಮಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಮತ್ಯಾವ ಆಯರಾಗಲಿ ಡಿಟೋ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡಿಸುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನು ಖುದ್ದು ಇದ್ದು ನಡಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಬದ್ಧನಾಗಿ ಈದೇನೆ.

ತಾರೀಖು } ರುಜು ಪಿಳ್ಳೆ

ಈ ಮೊಖ್ತ್ಯಾರುನಾಮಾ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನನಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯ ಸ್ಥರಾಗಿ ನನ್ನ ಸನುಕ್ಷಮ ರುಜು ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ

ಈ ಮೊಖ್ತ್ಯಾರು ನಾಮಾ ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ

Ramachandra Rao
Cof appl
15.11.30

Ramachandra Rao
Cof appl
15-11-30.

☞ ಸಿಕ್ಕುವ ಸ್ಥಳ :—ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಿಟಿ ಚಿಕ್ಕಪೇಟೆ, ವಿದ್ಯಾಸಾಗರ ಬುಕ್ಕು ಡಿಪೋ, ಬಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹೈಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್ರವರ್ರ ದೊರೆಯುತ್ತೆ

25th July 0

Rajakaryapravina
P.G. D'Souza, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

"Archakship of the Sri Venkataramanaswami and other temples at Hikkal"

In forwarding herewith a petition dated 21st July 1930 from Venkamma, widow of Archak Bhamachar presented through her Advocates messrs. S. Rajagopala Iyengar and K. Shamanna appealing against your order directing the continuance of the Archakship of the temples in the name of Devaraja Bhatta as officiator unless he is proved incompetent, I am directed to request you to submit the connected records with a report in the matter. and to state that the petitioner has been informed that no stay order can be issued in the matter.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

For Financial Secretary to Government.

Appendix F G—1

SUBJECT..... ....

....

... ...

Section Mug.

File No. 48.30.

Serial No.

No. 205/Rec.

Diary No. of letter replied to .....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *192*

Date of issue 25.7.30

Signed by M.V. S. Sastry

To

The Mug. Commr.
in Mysore.

Sir,

" Archakastha of Venkataramana Swami other temples

In forwarding herewith a petition dated 21st July 30 from Venkamma widow of Archak Shamachar presented thro her advocates Messrs S. Rajagopala Sirsugar and K. Shamanna appeal against your order dismissing the Continuance of the writ

List of enclosures

Copied by

Examined by..... . ...

of the temples in the name of
Devaraja Bhatta as officiator
unless he is proved incompetent.
I am directed to request you
to submit the connected records
with a report and to state that
the petitioner has been informed
that no stay order can be issued
in the matter

Thanks.

24/7/30 for H. Secy
GS MSK
23/7

25th July 30

Endorsement granted to Venkamma, widow of Archak Shamachar through her Advocates Messrs. S. Rajagopala Iyengar and K. Shamanna. Chickpet. Bangalore City.

With reference to her petition dated 21st July 1930 appealing against the Muzrai Commissioner's order in regard to the Archakship of the Sri Venkataramanaswamy temple and other temples at Hikkal, Tumkur Taluk, the petitioner is informed that a report has been called for from the Muzrai Commissioner in the matter and that no stay order can be granted as prayed for therein.

By order,

for Secretary to Government,
Financial Department.

25/7

C.R.G.

FG—1

ECT .....

.....

.....

Section Mis

File No. 48-30

Serial No. 3.

No. 206

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *192*

To

Endt:- Granted to Venkamma widow of Archak Shamachar thro' her advocates. Messrs. S. Rajagopala Iyengar and K. Shamanna.

Date of issue 25-7-30

Signed by Mr. V. S. Sastry

With reference to her petition dated 21-7-30 appealing against the Mng. Comm's order in regard to the archakship of the Sri Venkataramana Swamy temple and other temples at Hikkal, Thanjn.

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

over

WD 063—GPB—20,000—1-8-29

the petitioner is informed that a report has been called for from the Mng. Comm. in the matter and that no Stay order can be granted as prayed for therein

Bio

24.7.30

for H. Lecy

18/9/30

M. C. 13]

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE,

Bangalore, 15th September *193* 0.

No. 172 2w 5 Files 48-30-4
3037

FROM S. P. Rajagopalachari, Esq.,B.A., B.L.,

~~Rajakarvaravaina~~

~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~

Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.



To

Rajasevaparayana
B. Srinivasa Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of His
Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Financial Department.

SIR,

With reference to your letter No.205 Muz.48-30-2 dated --- 25th July 1930 calling for the records relating to the Archakship of Sri Venkataramanaswami and other temples at Nikkal village, -- Tumkur District, I have the honor to forward herewith, the vernacular records received with the Tumkur Deputy Commissioner's letter No.M. 307-30-31 dated 8th September 1930 (copy enclosed) together with -- this office files No.R.Dis.218/29-30 dated 28th April 1930 and ---- Appeal No.46/29-30 dated 4th July 1930 and to state that the facts of the case have been fully set forth in this office file R.Dis.218/ 29-30 dated 28th April 1930, and the Deputy Commissioner's file ----- bearing No.R.Dis. Muzrai Appeal 2/28-29 dated 22nd December 1928.

The appeal petition, together with its enclosures, received with your letter under reply is herewith returned.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

R. Narasimha Ayyangar.

for Muzrai Commissioner.

(Absent from Headquarters)

Letter No.M.307-30-31 dated 8th September 1930 from the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

Adverting to your memo No.172/30-31 dated 2nd August 1930, forwarding a copy of Financial Secretary's letter No.205 Muz.48-30-2 dated 25-7-1930 and calling for report with records relating to the Archakship of Sri Venkataramanaswami and other temples at Hikkal village, Tumkur Taluk, I have the honor to forward herewith the ---- vernacular records received with the Tumkur Sub Division Officer's Memo No.P.R.34/30-31 dated 21st August 1930, together with this office file bearing No.(1) R.Dis.M.3148/28-29 and (2) R.Dis.Muz.Appl.2/28-29 in which the facts of the case have been fully set-forth.

The appeal petition, together with its enclosures, received with your memo under reply is herewith returned.

"C o p y"

For Muzrai Commissioner.

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

Muzrai Appeal No. 2 of 1930-31.

Appellant	/s.	Respondent.
Archak Venkamma residing at Hikkal, Tumkur Taluk.		Devaraja Bhatta.

Subject.

Appeal against the orders of the Muzrai Commissioner in Muzrai Appeal No. 42 of 1928-29 and Muzrai Review 46 of 1929-30 on the file of his Court about the archakship of Sri Venkataramana Swami and other temples at Hikkal, Tumkur Taluk.

The case was heard on 23rd March 1931. The appellant Smt Venkamma was present and was represented by her Counsel ~~xxxxxx~~ Mr. Mallappa. The respondent Devaraja Bhatta was also present and was represented by his lawyer Mr. L. Krishnamma.

O R D E R.

The appellant is the Huzdar of the village of Hikkal and the temples and any one permitted to perform the duties of archaka can only work as her Gumasta. The appellant is not willing to continue the Respondent as her Gumasta. [illegible] Kaidal Srinivasachar is stated to be residing at Kaidal village in which the temples are situated while the respondent who is stated to be living elsewhere. There is no reason why Srinivasachar, the Gumasta proposed by the appellant should not be allowed to work as the archaka. In these circumstances the order of the Muzrai Commissioner is set aside and Appeal allowed.

Memo No. [illegible] dated, the above, the 24th March 1931
Copy of the above is forwarded with [illegible] to the Muzrai Commissioner with the records received [illegible] No. 1 of 1930-31 dated 17th September 1930.

By order,

[illegible]
for Assistant Secretary to Government.

(G)

Before the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

Mz3 Appeal No. 2 of 1930-31

Appellant.	*Vs.*	Respondent
Archak Venkamma residing at Sikkal. Tumkur Taluk		Devaraja Bhatta

Subject.

Appeal against the orders of the M-C in Mz3 appeal No 42 of 28-29 and Mz3 Review 46/29-30 on the file of his Court about the archakship of Sri Venkataramana Swami and other temples at Sikkal – Tumkur Dt.

The case was heard on 23rd march 1931.

The Appellant Venkamma was present and was represented by her Counsel Mr Malladappa: the Respondent Devaraja Bhatta was also present and was represented by his lawyer Mr. A. Krishnappa.

~~O~~ order

The Appellant is the Archak of the temples and any one permitted to perform the duties of the Office can only work

GPB—1,000—8-8-11

her Gumasta. (The appellant is not willing to continue as her gumasta) Her present nominee Vaidal Srinivasachar is stated to be residing in the Trichur village in which the temples are situated unlike Devaraja Ayyan the respondent who is stated to be living elsewhere. There is no reason why Srinivasachar the Gumasta proposed by the appellant should not be allowed to work as the Archak. In these circumstances the order of the M.C. is set aside and the appeal allowed.

No 2120/Sec. I Br
Mys 28-30-5. Dt- 28.3.31

Copy to M.C. with Compliments & records received with his letter No 172/30-31 dt 17-9-30.

B.O
25.3.31
for Secretary
H Dept

No 2122/Dt-28.3.31

Copy to Messrs K.N. Srinivasan
R.P. Vasudeva
A.S. Mallappa.
Advocates Bangalore city

No 2121/Dt- 28.3.31
Copy to Sri K. Krishnappa. Advocate Bangalore city

RS
27/3